

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 37650

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2010 Unpublished Opinion No. 725
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: December 2, 2010
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
CHRISTOPHER A. HARRY,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Cheri C. Copsey, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, and consecutive unified term of ten years for two counts of possession of sexually exploitative material, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before GUTIERREZ, Judge; GRATTON, Judge;
and MELANSON, Judge

PER CURIAM

Christopher A. Harry pled guilty to two counts of possession of sexually exploitative material. I.C. § 18-1507. The district court sentenced Harry to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for the first count and a consecutive unified indeterminate term of ten years for the second count. Harry appeals.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. See *State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App.

1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Harry's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.